

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Response, claims 1-5 are amended and claims 6 and 7 are added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above-amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagyu, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,899,955) in view of Link (U.S. Patent No. 5,184,303). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yagyu teaches a optimum route searching device that utilizes hierarchy maps when selecting map data to achieve the optimum route. Yagyu's system is designed such that abnormal routes such as a U-turn path and a bypass path when switching from various hierarchical level of maps is not created and erroneously provided to a user. As correctly stated in the Office Action, Yagyu does not teach or suggest utilizing any type of detour arrangement and thus does not teach or suggest searching a bypass region for a detour.

The Office Action alleges that link makes up for the deficiencies in Yagyu. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Link teaches a vehicle route planning system for calculating a desired route between a beginning destination location. The system allows for a user to input or specify a particular road or path that should not be considered in calculating the desired route, thus, causing the computer to create a detour. See abstract, column 6 lines 15-30. Links detour system allows the user to designate what type of detour data is being implemented such that the

computer knows whether to store this data for future use by the particular user, future use by all users or to remove from memory the detour information after completion of the trip.

Although Link teaches use of detour data, the detour data is specific to particular roads or segments of roads that are specified by a user. The user does not select a particular bypass region from which a detour can be acquired, as provided in the present invention. Further, Link's system does not perform searching of a detour route at the time when the bypass region is within the coverage map, whether being one of a low, medium or high density map information within the hierarchical structure, associated with the bypass region when utilized. In fact, Link teaches away from this particular feature of the present invention since Link calculates the desired trip along with the inputted detour segment prior to a user commencing the trip.

Therefore, Yagyu and Link fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a input device for specifying a bypass region to bypass traffic of a vehicle in response to an input operation by a user and detour searching device for searching a route that detours the bypass region only when the bypass region input by the input device in included within the coverage of the map information belonging the level of heirarchary acquired by the map information acquiring device, as recited in claim1.

Further, Yagyu and Link fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a bypass input device by which the user specifies a region within the route to bypass

and detour searching device that searches a bypass route that detours the bypass region, the detour searching device, performing the search when the user reaches an area within the route in which the acquired map data provides the specified bypass region, wherein the bypass route is displayed on the display device providing the user with the option to select the bypass route, as recited in claim 7.

Further, applicant notes that in regard to dependent claim 6, neither Yagyu nor Link teach or suggest displaying the bypass region and detoured route in providing the user with the option of selecting the detour route.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Yagyu and Link fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention as required.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to

conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____



Michael R. Cammarata

Reg.: 39,491

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MRC/CJB:cb
1163-0481P

Attachment(s)